

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
ARIZONA STRIP FIELD OFFICE
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW**

CX-AZ-130-2005-0029

PROJECT TITLE: Lizard Array Enclosures at Mt. Trumbull

PROJECT LEAD: Aaron Wilkerson

PROPOSED ACTION:

The Arizona Game & Fish Department plans to resume lizard sampling on the Mt. Trumbull study area in the spring of 2005. Cattle grazing, however, is incompatible with their sampling technique because trampling of the sampling arrays renders them inoperable.

The Arizona Game and Fish Department proposes to construct and maintain up to 21 temporary electric fence systems in the Mt. Trumbull area within the Mt. Logan grazing allotment (see attached map). Each fence system would be 50 meters on each side with the lizard array centered within the enclosure. Each enclosure would be constructed of two parallel smooth wires with flagging and an electric warning sign attached to each side of the top wire. The lower wire would be approximately 24 inches above ground and the top wire would be approximately 36 inches above ground. The two fence wires would be installed at least 12 inches apart in order to avoid deer entanglements. Metal posts will be used to hang the wire with no wire being attached to any living plant. A separate solar powered charge unit would be used for each array. Each fence system would be energized beginning July 1 through October 30. The arrays would be used until the fall of 2007 when they would be dismantled and completely removed from the area.

BLM is considering authorizing the placement of the lizard array enclosures as indicated in the project description, provided that no off-road vehicular traffic occur, except for the temporary use of 4-wheeler ATVs. All ATV access would be limited to the construction and dismantling of the enclosures; all maintenance and research monitoring access would be limited to foot traffic.

All pitfall buckets would be checked frequently and covered when not in use in order to avoid mortality to animals which may fall in them. In addition, AZGF would keep track of and report wildlife mortalities and any other problems associated with the reptile array enclosures.

Furthermore, no operations would be permitted during periods of wet or muddy conditions. Prior to the construction of the arrays, locations would be inventoried for potential impact to significant cultural resources by surface disturbance.

The Arizona Game & Fish Department, the Ecological Restoration Institute and the Mt. Logan Allotment permittee have been consulted.

LOCATION OF PROPOSED ACTION:

The proposed project is located within Mojave County, Arizona and is within the area legally described as follows: (map showing project location is attached)

T. 34 N., R 8 W., sections 8 & 9, Gila and Salt River Meridian

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW:

The proposed action is consistent with the 1992 Arizona Strip Resource Management Plan as required by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA).

Specific RMP decisions include:

WL02 Maintain productive wildlife habitat and ensure wildlife needs and considerations are incorporated into land use planning, National Environmental Policy Act documents and management decisions.

WL04 Conduct inventories to obtain information required to effectively manage habitat and incorporate wildlife habitat considerations into activities of other programs.

FW02 Maintain healthy, viable and biologically diverse forest ecosystems that will meet the needs of wildlife, recreation, livestock grazing, watershed and other resources. Commercial forestry or harvest is not the primary objective of activity plans.

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM Chapter 6, Appendix 5.4, H (9) that states: "Construction of small protective enclosures including those to protect reservoirs and springs and those to protect small study areas."

The application of this categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects which may significantly affect the environment. These extraordinary circumstances are contained in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2.

Non-electric fencing has been considered, however, this would require at least one extra strand and the added expense that goes along with installing it.

The proposal has been reviewed to determine if any of the exceptions described in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2, apply. Surname(s) verify completion of this review by appropriate specialists.

NAME	LIST OF EXCLUSION CRITERIA
------	----------------------------

Shurtz	1. The proposal would have no adverse effects on public health or safety:
--------	---

Spotts, Herron	2. The proposal would not adversely affect unique geographic characteristics such as park, recreation, or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wilderness study areas, wild and scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains, or ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks.
----------------	--

Herron	3. The proposal would have no adverse effects on historic or cultural resources: <i>Identify the effect if any</i>
--------	---

- Spotts 4. The proposal would have no highly controversial environmental effects.
- Spotts 5. The proposal would have no highly uncertain or potentially significant environmental effects nor does it involve unique or unknown environmental risks:
- Spotts 6. The proposal would not establish a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration with potentially significant environmental effects:
- Herron 7. The proposal is not directly related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant effects
- Heron 8. The proposal would not adversely affect properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places:
- Hughes 9. The proposal would not adversely affect a plant species listed or proposed to be listed on the list of endangered and threatened species, nor have adverse effects on designated critical habitat for these species: *Identify the species and effect if any*
- Herder, Small 10. The proposal would not adversely affect an animal species listed or proposed to be listed on the list of endangered and threatened species, nor have adverse effects on designated critical habitat for these species: *Identify the species and effect if any*
- Smith 11. The proposal would not require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management) or Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands).
- Herder, Small 12. The proposal would not require compliance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act:
- Benson, Spotts 13. The proposal does not threaten to violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment:
- Spotts 14. The proposal is in conformance with the Arizona Strip District Resource Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement (January, 1992)

DECISION: We have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposal is in conformance with the approved land use plan, that it would have no significant environmental effects, and that no further environmental analysis is required.

REVIEWED BY: _____ DATE: _____

Environmental Coordinator - Arizona Strip

IT IS MY DECISION TO IMPLEMENT THE PROPOSAL, AS DESCRIBED.

APPROVED BY: _____ DATE: _____

Field Manager - Arizona Strip